United Nations A/C.2/71/SR.24

General Assembly
Seventy-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
15 November 2016

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 24th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 8 November 2016, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Djani ..... (Indonesia)

Contents

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(j) Sustainable mountain development (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

Agenda item 25: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 59: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

16-19511 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(j) Sustainable mountain development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.18)

Draft resolution on sustainable mountain development (A/C.2/71/L.18)

1. **Ms. Mele** (Italy), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.18 also on behalf of Peru, said that, since the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change had all shaped a new paradigm for sustainable mountain development. The draft resolution had been aligned with the implementation of those four agreements and updated with new information regarding the special vulnerabilities of mountain peoples and ecosystems, in particular in developing countries. The various actions that had been taken around the world to address those specific challenges had also been incorporated in the draft resolution.

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.37)

Draft resolution entitled "Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system" (A/C.2/71/L.37)

2. **Mr. Tatiyapermpoon** (Thailand), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.37 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the 2016 quadrennial comprehensive policy review should provide the United Nations development system with the strategic guidance necessary to strengthen the system, with a view to improving its support to Member States in their respective efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda. The draft resolution emphasized the importance of the principle of national ownership, which should guide the system's response to the needs and priorities of Member States. It clearly outlined the expectations of Member States concerning operational activities for development and described how the system should be financed and governed in order to carry out its mandates. The draft resolution also demonstrated how the critical issue of the resident coordinator system should be addressed. Finally, it stressed the crucial importance of having a clear system-wide monitoring and reporting mechanism for Member States to be able to follow up and review implementation.

Agenda item 25: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.28)

Draft resolution entitled "Sustainable Gastronomy Day" (A/C.2/71/L.28)

3. **Mr. Tenya Hasegawa** (Peru), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.28, said that in his country, as in many others, gastronomy was a clear example of the catalysing role that culture could play in favour of sustainable development; it was an ideal means to increase awareness of the integrated nature of sustainable development and mobilize all people, through their daily food consumption patterns, to contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

4. By establishing an international day for sustainable gastronomy, the draft resolution sought to recognize the potential of gastronomy and the shared responsibility to realize global goals such as eradicating poverty and hunger, promoting sustainable agriculture and food security, ensuring healthy lifestyles, promoting continuous learning and decent work, empowering women, promoting inclusive economic growth, reducing inequality, encouraging the sustainable use of terrestrial and marine ecosystems, and promoting sustainable patterns of production and consumption.

5. As could be clearly seen in the fields, markets and kitchens where food was shared throughout the world, all of the aforementioned goals were interconnected and indivisible. The celebration of an international sustainable gastronomy day could therefore have a great impact on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The proposed date was 22 June, which was close to the summer solstice, a day of great agricultural importance.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.2)

Draft resolution on the oil slick on Lebanese shores (A/C.2/71/L.2)

6. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.2 had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested by Israel.

7. **Ms. Niyomthai** (Thailand), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group highly valued consensus and the unique and meaningful tradition of adopting almost all draft resolutions by consensus in the Second Committee. It recognized the multidimensional, adverse impact of the oil slick on Lebanese shores and on other countries directly affected by the oil slick, such as the Syrian Arab Republic, whose shores had been partially polluted. Member States, international organizations, international and regional financial institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector were urged to intensify their support, particularly for recovery and rehabilitation activities.

8. **Mr. Mansour** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the valuable time of the Second Committee had once again been hijacked for political purposes. Instead of tackling the major social, economic and environmental challenges at hand, the Committee was being cynically used to advance narrow political objectives. There had been 10 years of useless discussion on an issue that was irrelevant to current environmental challenges. The draft resolution failed to mention that the conflict had been initiated in 2006 by Hizbullah, which was recognized as a terrorist organization by many delegations, including the main supporters of the draft resolution. For more than one month, Hizbullah had fired thousands of rockets at Israeli towns, using civilians as a human shield and causing immense damage to civilian infrastructure and forests and wildlife.

9. Immediately after the event causing the oil slick, Israel had allowed for aerial photographs to be taken; it had also offered to provide special equipment to treat the oil slick. The draft resolution did not mention the extensive cooperation between Israel and the United Nations Development Programme or the other United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations addressing the environmental situation along the coast of Lebanon. The 2007 report entitled "Lebanon, Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment", published by the United Nations Environment Programme, had illustrated that the damage of the oil slick was not as severe as initially stated by Lebanese authorities; it did not implicate Israel in any way.

10. The sanitation problem in Lebanon was much more urgent. For over two years, Lebanon had been flooded with waste, causing severe health problems to its people and its neighbours. Illegal garbage burning near the border with Israel had caused serious health hazards to that population.

11. Despite the fact that the oil slick no longer existed, the Committee continued to focus on it rather than deal with issues of real environmental impact. The point of the exercise was solely to demonize and isolate Israel. It was time to remove the resolution from the agenda and allow the international community to focus on more important issues. His delegation called on all those who respected the professional nature of the Committee to vote against the draft resolution.

12. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.2.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, South Sudan, Tonga, Vanuatu.

Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.2 was adopted by 156 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

13. **Mr. Abbas** (Lebanon) said that said that for the eleventh consecutive year, the Second Committee had voted overwhelmingly in favour of the draft resolution, acknowledging the serious adverse environmental, economic and health-related implications of the oil slick in Lebanon as a consequence of the Israeli bombing of El-Jiyeh electric power plant in 2006. The resulting oil spill had entirely covered the Lebanese coastline and also affected the country's neighbours and a significant surface area of the eastern Mediterranean Sea.

14. The draft resolution reaffirmed the Second Committee's commitment to upholding international law, in particular the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the rules and principles of international environmental law. The international community must hold countries responsible for internationally wrongful acts: time must not be seen as a vehicle for impunity. According to the report of the Secretary-General on the oil slick on Lebanese shores (A/71/217), compensation for damages would amount to $856.4 million. Lebanon would continue to mobilize all resources necessary and resort to all legal means to ensure that the draft resolution was fully implemented and compensation was promptly provided.

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.3/Rev.1)

Draft resolution entitled "Towards a New International Economic Order" (A/C.2/71/L.3/Rev.1)

15. **The Chair** said that the revised draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

16. **Ms. Niyomthai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the revised draft resolution was highly relevant in the context of the 2030 Agenda and all other international agreements. It was also in accordance with the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. Adopting the draft resolution would foster policy coherence and create an enabling environment for sustainable development at all levels. That meant not only broadening and strengthening the voice and participation of developing countries in international economic decision-making, norm-setting and governance, but also undertaking the necessary reforms for coherent and mutually supporting world trade and monetary and financial systems, while respecting each country's policy space.

17. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had consistently voted against the resolution in past years, as it fell short of the current dialogue on shared economic, social and development priorities. The world economy and the challenges facing it were vastly different from those of the mid-1970s. The extraordinary growth in trade and international investment had created interdependent economies, while emerging economies had lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty. While the United States was committed to working in global solidarity, the substance of the resolution remained dated, divisive and counterproductive.

18. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.3/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Moldova, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Palau, Republic of Korea, South Sudan, Tonga, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.3/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 48, with 7 abstentions.

19. **Ms. Zolcerová** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) adopted in 1974 did not provide a contemporary framework for addressing the multiple challenges of the globalized world. The European Union was concerned that reverting to the concepts of the mid-1970s could send an inaccurate message about the ability of the United Nations to contribute to solving the world's current problems and risked marginalizing the role of the United Nations in global economic governance.

20. Moreover, the resolution continued to deal with substantive issues that were already covered in other General Assembly resolutions. The European Union attached great importance to the Second Committee delivering its full potential in view of the 2030 Agenda. It remained committed to engaging in good faith to achieve that end and would seek to avoid duplication of its work with other United Nations bodies and within the Committee.

21. In that regard, it was important for the work of the Committee to build on recent outcomes, including the Sendai Framework, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement. The debates and outcomes achieved in other relevant institutions, such as the Bretton Woods institutions, the World Trade Organization and the Group of 20, must also be considered. The European Union was ready to engage constructively in discussions aimed at improving and enhancing global economic governance with a view to a strong, coherent, inclusive and representative international architecture for sustainable development, while respecting the mandates of respective organizations. Multilateral solutions must be promoted to common problems, using the closest possible international cooperation to deliver on the landmark agreements reached in 2015, thereby promoting inclusive growth and sustainable development.

Agenda item 59: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.35)

Draft resolution on permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (A/C.2/71/L.35)

22. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.35 contained no programme budget implications and that Turkey had joined the list of sponsors.

23. **Ms. Niyomthai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group reiterated its unwavering and unequivocal support for the economic development efforts and aspirations of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan. That agenda item was indivisible and relevant to the work of the Committee, and the implementation of the draft resolution was important. The 2030 Agenda and other major outcome documents of the sustainable development framework offered hope for the betterment of peoples living under colonial and foreign occupation. However, the report of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) on the economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/71/86-E/2016/13) had revealed that the Palestinian and Syrian people would not enjoy the fruits of sustainable development until they had sovereignty over their natural resources. In the implementation, follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, therefore, the international community must not forget the severe difficulties faced by countries and peoples living under colonial and foreign occupation, and must strive to achieve the full realization of the right of self-determination.

24. **Mr. Mansour** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the ESCWA report (A/71/86-E/2016/13) was one-sided and based on selective and often unreliable data. In short, it was everything that a report of the United Nations should not be. Such reports, and the statements made in connection with the agenda item, formed another chapter in the saga of anti-Israel sentiment that had turned the United Nations into the Palestinians' private theatre of the absurd. Both the report and the draft resolution distorted the facts and undermined the Committee's credibility by ignoring the real factors that were impeding Palestinian development.

25. His country had fulfilled its obligations under the water agreement signed by both sides in 1995, whereas the Palestinians continually drilled unauthorized wells and allowed Palestinian sewage to drain into Israeli streams. Israel continued to supply the Gaza Strip with water even though it was under the control of the Hamas terrorist organization. However, the Palestinian Authority was obstructing water infrastructure improvements by refusing to sign the protocol to the water agreement or to provide estimates of its population and water needs. Without a change in Palestinian behaviour, a severe water crisis could be expected in the coming summer.

26. At a time when Israelis and Palestinians needed to rise above their political differences to confront the threats posed to both by climate change, the draft resolution only served to push the two sides further apart. It made no mention of the 2016 agreement waiving a significant portion of the Palestinian Authority's debt to Israel, the ongoing cooperation in the field of pest control or the efforts of Israel to combat the smuggling of hazardous waste. His delegation had called for a vote on the draft resolution, and urged any delegations that cared about the integrity of the Committee to vote against it.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.35.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia,

Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, South Sudan, United States.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Togo, Tonga, Vanuatu

Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.35 was adopted by 155 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

27. **Ms. Zolcerová** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that, as in the past, the European Union would support the draft resolution. However, the use of the term Palestine in the draft resolution could not be construed as recognition of the State of Palestine and was without prejudice to the individual position of Member States on that issue and on the validity of accession by Palestine to the conventions and treaties mentioned therein.

28. In addition, the adoption of the draft resolution was without prejudice to the results of the discussions on the revitalization of the work of the Second Committee, in particular with regard to the addition of subjects to the agenda and the reports ensuring the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Committee's work.

29. **Mr. Shawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that in the case of the Palestinian question, there was a clear dividing line between absolute good and absolute evil, as was illustrated by the lopsided vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, he conceded that the draft resolution would change nothing on the ground. Israel, with the encouragement of certain other States would continue to flout international law by moving its citizens onto occupied land and building its racist separation wall.

30. What the representative of the occupying Power had said about cooperation on the water issue was a pack of lies. Israel stole the bulk of its water from the West Bank, and millions of cubic metres were also being stolen from Gaza. During the first four months of the occupation in 1967, Israel had issued no fewer than five military orders that gave it control over Palestinian water. The ESCWA report documented how the 2014 Gaza war had affected water supplies for up to 1 million people, and calculated the water consumption of Israelis on the West Bank at seven times that of Palestinians, leaving some Palestinians with as little as one fifth of the per capita daily amount of water recommended by the World Health Organization.

31. **Mr. Mansour** (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at a time when Israel and the entire world were fighting terrorism on all fronts, the issues of the environment and climate change could serve as a bridge to peace. However, the Palestinians were refusing to sign a protocol to the water agreement that would increase the supply of water to both the West Bank and Gaza. Israel was doing the best it could without Palestinian cooperation. The representative of the Palestinian Authority himself had conceded that 95 per cent of households in the West Bank were connected to running water. He called on the international community to pressure the Palestinian Authority to cooperate on an issue where the two sides had common ground.

The meeting rose at 4.05 p.m.